

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 497

October 24, 1995, 3:10 p.m.
Page S-15544 Temp. Record

TEMPORARY FEDERAL JUDGESHIPS/Hungry & Uninsured Children

SUBJECT: Commencement Date of Temporary Judgeships . . . S. 1328. Wellstone motion to table the Wellstone perfecting amendment No. 2944 to the Santorum amendment No. 2943.

ACTION: MOTION TO TABLE AGREED TO, 53-45

SYNOPSIS: As introduced, S. 1328, a bill to extend the commencement date of certain Federal judgeships, will amend a 1990 Act creating 13 additional, temporary posts for Federal judges.

The Santorum amendment would express the sense of the Senate that Congress should enact the President's budget as revised on June 13, 1995. (The amendment was offered to give Senators the opportunity to express their opinion of that revised plan by voting on it.) The amendment would make several findings, including:

- the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) has determined that enactment of the President's proposal would result in deficits in excess of \$200 billion in each of fiscal years (FYs) 1997 through 2005;
- the President has claimed that his revised budget would result in a balanced Federal budget by FY 2002;
- the President's budget, like every budget he has ever submitted, uses Social Security surpluses in budget calculations; and
- the President has stated that Presidents should rely on the CBO's projections instead of their own estimates because the CBO consistently makes better estimates.

The Wellstone perfecting amendment to the Santorum amendment would strike all after the first word of the amendment and would insert the following: "In the event provisions of the FY 1996 Budget Reconciliation bill are enacted which result in an increase in the number of hungry or medically uninsured children by the end of FY 1996, the Congress shall revisit the provisions of said bill which cause such increase and shall, as soon as practicable thereafter, adopt legislation which would halt any continuation of such increase."

During debate, Senator Wellstone moved to table the Wellstone amendment. The motion to table is not debatable; however, Senator Wellstone spoke on his amendment before making the motion. Generally, those favoring the motion to table opposed the amendment; those opposing the motion to table favored the amendment.

(See other side)

YEAS (53)		NAYS (45)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republicans (53 or 100%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans (0 or 0%)	Democrats (45 or 100%)	Republicans (0)	Democrats (1)
Abraham	Helms	Akaka	Inouye		Bradley ⁻²
Ashcroft	Hutchison	Baucus	Johnston		
Bennett	Inhofe	Biden	Kennedy		
Bond	Jeffords	Bingaman	Kerrey		
Brown	Kassebaum	Boxer	Kerry		
Burns	Kempthorne	Breaux	Kohl		
Campbell	Kyl	Bryan	Lautenberg		
Chafee	Lott	Bumpers	Leahy		
Coats	Lugar	Byrd	Levin		
Cochran	Mack	Conrad	Lieberman		
Cohen	McCain	Daschle	Mikulski		
Coverdell	McConnell	Dodd	Moseley-Braun		
Craig	Murkowski	Dorgan	Moynihan		
D'Amato	Nickles	Exon	Murray		
DeWine	Pressler	Feingold	Nunn		
Dole	Roth	Feinstein	Pell		
Domenici	Santorum	Ford	Pryor		
Faircloth	Shelby	Glenn	Reid		
Frist	Simpson	Graham	Robb		
Gorton	Smith	Harkin	Rockefeller		
Gramm	Snowe	Heflin	Sarbanes		
Grams	Specter	Hollings	Simon		
Grassley	Stevens		Wellstone		
Gregg	Thomas				
Hatch	Thompson				
Hatfield	Thurmond				
	Warner				

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

No arguments were expressed in favor of the motion to table.

Those opposing the motion to table contended:

Our colleagues are so eager to put the Senate on record on the President's revised budget that they could not wait for the start of the reconciliation debate tomorrow. If they want to start early, that is their right under the Senate rules, but it is our right as well to offer amendments which we are eager to have the Senate consider. Accordingly, we have offered the Wellstone amendment to the Santorum amendment. The Wellstone amendment would strike the text of the Santorum amendment and would instead require Congress to overturn any parts of this reconciliation bill in the future if it turns out that they increase the number of hungry or medically uninsured children in America. Our guess is that many provisions of this bill will result in many hungry and uninsured children. S. 1328 will cut welfare programs across-the-board--food stamps, the Women, Infants, and Children Program, Medicaid, and other programs will be drastically reduced. It may sound good to some people to say they are cutting welfare, but when they see the results we think they will be horrified. We remember seeing children with distended bellies before President Nixon greatly expanded the Food Stamp Program; we have also seen children who could not study because they had abscessed teeth and their parents could not afford to send them to dentists. The proposed cuts are absolutely reckless. If the Federal Government is not willing to step in and take care of poor children in need, no one else will. Our colleagues this year have shown they are willing to spend billions on unneeded defense items, and they have voted for tax cuts for wealthy Americans. We are confident they will now unanimously vote with us to pass the Wellstone amendment as an alternative to the Santorum amendment, to show their support for poor children.